THE EFFECTIVENESS OF USING SEMANTIC MAPPING STRATEGY TO TEACH READING ANALYTICAL EXPOSITION TEXTS TO THE ELEVENTH GRADERS OF CENDEKIA SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL SIDOARJO

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF USING SEMANTIC MAPPING STRATEGY TO TEACH READING ANALYTICAL EXPOSITION TEXTS TO THE ELEVENTH GRADERS OF CENDEKIA SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL SIDOARJO

Inas Twinda Puspita
English Education, Faculty of Languages and Arts, State University of Surabaya
11020084032.inas@gmail.com

Kusumarasdyati, Ph.D.
English Education, Faculty of Languages and Arts, State University of Surabaya

Abstrak

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui efektifitas dari penggunaan strategi semantic mapping pada kemampuan membaca teks eksposisi analitis siswa-siswa kelas sebelas SMA Cendekia Sidoarjo. Penelitian ini merupakan eksperimental dimana dua kelompok telah dipilih terlebih dahulu secara acak, yaitu kelompok kontrol dan eksperimental. Pada awal penelitian, mereka diberikan tes membaca yang berfungsi sebagai pre-test pada kedua kelompok untuk mengetahui kemampuan membaca teks eksposisi analitis sebelum peneliti memberikan perlakuan khusus. Selanjutnya, strategi semantic mapping diterapkan pada proses pembelajaran membaca teks eksposisi analitis untuk kelompok eksperimental, sedangkan pada kelompok kontrol diajar dengan tanpa strategi semantic mapping. Setelah memberikan perlakuan khusus, peneliti melaksanakan post-test pada kedua kelompok. Sebuah analisis t-test pada SPSS 20.00 digunakan untuk menganalisa hasil pre-tes dan post-tes dari kelompok kontrol dan eksperimental. Hasil dari penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa pengaktifan dari peripheral learning strategy memiliki efek yang signifikan untuk meningkatkan kemampuan menulis teks deskriptif siswa, (P<.05)

Kata kunci *: Membaca, Teks Eksposisi Analitis, Strategi Semantic Mapping*

Abstract

This study aims to know the effectiveness of semantic mapping strategy to teach reading analytical exposition text to the eleventh graders of Cendekia Senior High School Sidoarjo. This study was an experimental research in which two groups were selected randomly, namely control and experimental groups. In the beginning of the study, the researcher administered pre-test for both control and experimental groups. Then, the researcher applied semantic mapping as a strategy in teaching reading analytical exposition text to the experimental group, while the control group was taught without semantic mapping strategy. A t-test on SPSS 16.00 was used to analyze the result of pre-test and post-test from experimental and control groups. The results showed that the activation of peripheral learning strategy had a significant effect to improve the students' descriptive writing ability, (P<.05).

Keywords*: Reading Skill, Analytical Exposition Text, Semantic Mapping Strategy*

INTRODUCTION

Reading ability is important for students to enhance knowledge and to get latest information (Cochran, 1993). Reading does not only provide students about the writer's ideas, but it also helps students to clarify difficult aspects of the students' interest. Several information in new texts read by students can blend with their past knowledge and experience which later help correct misunderstanding. For instance, students read argumentative composition to get information on how people view a particular issue. Moreover, reading activities accommodate people to get the latest information. By reading, students are able to follow some information such as how education fits the 21st century and how technology provides complex types of media ICT. Therefore, reading is important to master.

As one of reading competences, reading analytical exposition texts is very important for

students to gain lots of people's perspectives. It means that by reading analytical exposition texts, students can be more open minded about various perspectives so that they do not only stuck on one point of view. For instance, students read a headline in newspaper about the reshuffle governmental cabinet which surely consists of pros and cons. It will be different from one newspaper to others because there are more than one perspective related to the same headline. Therefore, students need to familiarize themselves with reading analytical exposition text.

To cope with the ability of reading analytical exposition texts, Education Ministry of Indonesia makes such ability as one of reading competences in curriculum 2013. In this curriculum, students in the eleventh grade are required to analyze the social function, structure, and language features of analytical exposition texts. Moreover, students need to comprehend the meaning on the analytical exposition texts about the current issues (*KD. 3.10 and 4.14).*

Unfortunately, most eleventh graders were difficult to understand the text when they must read analytical exposition texts. This situation was noticed when the researcher conducted an early observation in Cendekia Senior High School Sidoarjo for fulfilling the assignment of ELT Methods course. Most students felt confused to read analytical exposition texts because they only stuck on one perspective while other perspectives are considered wrong. Furthermore, the teacher only asked students to read the texts and answer the questions instead of giving them kinds of strategies that can make the students comprehend the text very well. This conventional teaching strategy indicated the monotonous teaching and learning process which make students confused and uninterested to read analytical exposition texts.

To solve this problem, the researcher tries to implement semantic mapping as a strategy in teaching reading analytical exposition texts to the eleventh graders of Cendekia Senior High School Sidoarjo. According to Santa, Havens, and Valdes (2004), semantic mapping strategy is an activity during teaching and learning process that requires students to create graphic arrangement of associated key words, ideas or concepts that illustrate how the construction of point of view and argument. It means that semantic mapping can be used as a strategy to teach reading analytical exposition texts since it aims to reveal easily the content of the text including the point of view and arguments.

Semantic mapping strategy aims to optimize teaching and learning process by applying a collaborative effort between teacher and students (Vancil, 1986 in Keshavarz, 2013). Therefore, the application of semantic mapping strategy can build good atmosphere in the teaching and learning process that makes students more interest to follow the reading activities.

There are two researches who have conducted the study related to the implementation of semantic mapping as a strategy in teaching analytical exposition texts previously. The first study was conducted by Kumalasari (2009), she focused on the use of semantic mapping to compose analytical exposition texts. From her findings, it was showed that by using semantic mapping strategy, the eleventh graders of SMAN 6 Semarang can reach the indicators of the basic competence of analytical exposition writing as stated in *Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan (*KTSP). It was proved by 24 out of 38 students who could improve their scores in analytical exposition writing by applying semantic mapping strategy.

Next, Djoni (2015) also implemented a classroom action research by using semantic mapping strategy in SMA Kalam Kudus Padang and the text used was analytical exposition text. The result showed that the students' score increased after the implementation of semantic mapping strategy. It was proved by the increase of the students' mean score from 55.89 in the pre-test to 63.16 in Cycle 1, and 75.05 in Cycle 2.

The difference between the first previous study and this study is on the skill observed. Kumalasari (2009) focused on the semantic mapping strategy in writing skill, while this study examined the strategy in reading skill. Meanwhile, the difference between the second previous study and this study is on the research design. Djoni (2015) conducted classroom action research with two cycles, while this study was experimental research design.

The researcher chose reading as the skill in this study since students need to reveal easily the content of analytical exposition texts, while in fact the teacher in Cendekia Senior High School Sidoarjo teaches them monotonously rather than giving kinds of strategies. Besides, analytical exposition text in curriculum 2013 is require students to analyze and comprehend the social function, generic structures, and language

features of analytical exposition text instead of composing the text.

Referring to the background of the study, the researcher formulated the research question as follows:

(1) Is there any significant difference between eleventh graders who are taught reading analytical exposition texts by using Semantic Mapping Strategy and those who are not in Cendekia Senior High School Sidoarjo?

RESEARCH METHOD

This study was a quantitative research based on computation and measurement, operational variables and statistics. This research used experimental research design. It concerned primarily with discovering the effectiveness between or among interrelationship of two variables at the same time. Best (1977:102) stated that experimental research design is the blueprint of the procedures that enables the researcher to test his hypothesis by reaching valid conclusions about relationships between independent and dependent variables.

The focus of this study is the reading activity conducted in the eleventh graders of Cendekia Senior High School Sidoarjo. Considering the focus on the research, eleventh graders are the most appropriate participants because according to the syllabus of 2013 curriculum the students of this grade received the material of analytical exposition texts. There were two groups in the experimental research design; the experimental (XI-P1) and the control groups (XI-S1). The two classes is choosen to be observed by using simple random sampling. The procedure of experiment design included pre-test, treatments and post-test. Firstly, both of groups were given a pre-test. Then, the treatments were applied; the experimental group was treated by using semantic mapping strategy and the control group was taught without semantic mapping strategy. Finally, the experimental group and the control group did the post-test. The results of pre-test and post-test of each group were compared to find the significant difference between the experimental and the control groups by using *Independent Sample T-test* on SPSS 20.0.

To collect data that is needed for this study, the researcher used completion items test; which consists of tryout, pre-test and post-test. The researcher administered tryout on April 28th 2015 in the class of XI-S2 that consists of 30 students. Try out was conducted in order to know the test validity and reliability. It was important to know the quality of the test whether it was suitable or not to be used and as the instrument. Try out was conducted in the class which did not belong to the sample of the research. Since it was completion items test, the score for the right answer was 1 and 0 for the wrong answer. After that, the data gained from the try out was calculated by KR-21 and as the result the level of reliability of the test was reliable (.74).

Then, pre-test was administered on 4th of May 2015; it was managed to know the students' reading ability in each group (experimental and control groups) at the beginning of study. After administering the pre-test, the researcher gave treatments (semantic mapping strategy) to the experimental group on 9th, 16th and 23th of May 2015, while the control group was taught without the treatments. During teaching and learning process in the experimental group's class, the researcher applied semantic mapping as a strategy in teaching reading analytical exposition texts. The researcher started the lesson by gave several questios to the students related to the material. After that, the researcher explained briefly about the strategy that would be use as strategy that is semantic mapping strategy. Here, the students paid attention to the researcher's explanation.

The students were interesting to the strategy that would be applied. When the lesson begins, the researcher wrote the topic or main concept in the center of the map. The researcher started the pre-reading discussion that focused on the content words. As students respond to concept-related questions, the researcher wrote the word and students' meanings and responses on the map and directs the students to do the same. When students failed to respond to the concept-related questions, the researcher offered a contextual definition of the word that facilitated students' understanding of the text. As students read, the researcher reminds students to write down questions about words that need clarification. The researcher engaged students in an extended discussion on their reading, focused

on the content words. The researcher asked the students to use their semantic maps during the discussion of their reading. The researcher engaged students in a discussion that further promotes and deepens their understanding of the content words by building on their conceptual knowledge. The researcher guided the discussion with questions that would help students to further understand what they have read. As the students respond to the questions, the researcher wrote their responses on the large semantic map as they took additional notes on their own maps.

Finally, after conducting the treatments, the post-test was administered on 30th of May 2015. It was aimed to measure the differences of the students' achievement in reading analytical exposition texts to both experimental and control groups. The test was administered with 10 questions in form of completion items test. Then, the data were collected and analyzed.

RESULT OF THE STUDY

The first step which was done by the researcher is conducting tryout test. After considering that the test is valid and reliable, the researcher conducted pre-test to control and experimental groups; it was used to know if the students of both groups have equal ability in reading. Then, the researcher scored the pre-test of control and experimental groups and calculated it by using *Independent Sample T-test* on SPSS 20.0. According to Pallant (2010:239) an independent-samples t-test is used when you want to compare the mean score, on some continuous variable, for two different groups of participants.

Group Statistics

	Class	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
PreTest Score	Control Group	28	72,50	6,455	1,220
	Experimental Group	28	73,93	6,853	1,295

The result shows that the mean score of control group in pre-test is 72.50 (SD = 6.455) and the mean score of experimental group in the pre-test is 73.93 (SD = 6.853). The researcher found out that experimental group's pre-test score is higher than control group's score. Although experimental group had a higher score than control group in pre-test, the students' reading ability is equal.

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
PreTest Score	Equal variances assumed	,391	,534	-,803	54	,426	-1,429	1,779	-4,995	2,138
	Equal variances not assumed			-,803	53,808	,426	-1,429	1,779	-4,996	2,139

The researcher includes the independent sample T-test analysis that has been used to analyze pre-test scores of experimental and control groups. It can be seen from the significance level of Levene's test is .534 or larger than .05. Then, the researcher used the information in the first line of the t-test, which refers to Equal variances assumed. If the Sig. Value for Lavene's test is larger than 0,5, the first line stated in the table must be utilized; it refers to Equal Variances Assumed (Pallant, 2010:241). However, it can be concluded that the reading ability between control and experimental groups are equal at the beginning of the study.

After that, the researcher applied treatments in experimental group. The treatments were managed three times. Then, the researcher conducted post-test to both control and experimental groups in order to find out the significant difference of the students' reading ability of analytical exposition texts in experimental group after giving some treatments.

Group Statistics

	Class	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
PostTest Score	Control Group	28	75,71	5,727	1,082
	Experimental Group	28	86,43	7,310	1,381

The post-test mean score of control group is 75.71 (SD = 5.727) and the post-test mean score of experimental group is 86.43 (SD = 7.310). The researcher concluded that experimental group has higher mean score than control group in post-test. In order to ascertain if the result is significant, it refers to the coloumn labeled Sig. (2-tailed) which appears under the section labeled t-test for Equality of Means (Pallant, 2010:242). The researcher found that the Sig. (2-tailed) is .000 or less than .05; it means that the mean scores of post-test of control and experimental groups are significantly different, along with 95% confidence interval of difference showing the lower value -14.233 and the upper value -7196 (df = 54,4).

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
PostTest Score	Equal variances assumed	2,486	,121	-6,105	54	,000	-10,714	1,755	-14,233	-7,196
	Equal variances not assumed			-6,105	51,076	,000	-10,714	1,755	-14,238	-7,191

In order to clarify the effect size of some treatments that were given, the researcher calculated it with the formula *Eta Squared* which has three scales as proposed by Pallant (2010:243); .01 is small effect, .06 is moderate effect, and .14 or above is large effect. Calculation of Eta Squared was analyzed by the researcher and it is presented as follow:

$$\text{Eta Square} = \frac{t^2}{t^2 + (N-1)}$$

$$= \frac{1499}{1499 + (28-1)}$$

$$= \frac{1499}{1526}$$

$$= 0.98 \text{ (Large Effect)}$$

From this calculation, it can be found out that the Eta Squared value is .98, it means that the treatments which were given by the researcher have large effect. In another word, it has answered the alternative hypothesis in the first chapter that there is a significant difference of students' reading ability of analytical exposition text after the researcher applied semantic mapping strategy to the eleventh graders of Cendekia Senior High School Sidoarjo.

CONCLUSION

Based on the explanations above, it can be concluded that the use of semantic mapping strategy gave a significant effect on students' reading ability of analytical exposition text of the eleventh graders. It was proven by the higher score from the experimental group who was given semantic mapping strategy than the control group who was not. Besides, the application of this strategy have a large effect on the treatments which were given by the researcher.

The result of this study supports the theory from Carell, Pharis, and Liberto (1989) that semantic mapping strategy can be very useful for reading strategy since it involves brainstorm phase in which students develop a map based on a topic before or after reading a text. The brainstorming phase of semantic mapping is intended to activate the readers' prior knowledge. It gives the teacher an insight into the schemata of each of her students, thus revealing the amount of interest, level of readiness, gaps, misconceptions, and errors (Pearson & Johnson, 1978).

Furthermore, Santa, Havens, and Valdes (2004) that semantic mapping is an activity during teaching and learning process that requires students to create graphic arrangement of associated key words, ideas or concepts that illustrate how point of view and argument are constructed. It also supports the theory from Zaid (1995) that semantic mapping strategy aims to help students identify point of view and how this point fits to the arguments. Thus, semantic mapping strategy can be used in the teaching and learning process of reading analytical exposition texts since it aims to reveal easily the content of the text including the point of view and arguments.

According to Chall (1996), the steps in the creation of semantic maps seem particularly applicable as a teaching strategy for analyzing the concepts and vocabulary in the text, arranging the words in a map that depicts the inter-relationships between the concepts, and adding the words or concepts that are already understood by the students to the diagram in order to depict the relationships between what the students know and the information in the text. That fact was also found in this study related to the test given which undercovered all those aspects mentioned and the

result showed that the students could pass the test well.

This study also supports the theory from Guastello, Beasley, and Sinatra (2000), that semantic mapping strategy is valuable instructional tool. It shows the order and completeness of a students' thinking process; strengths and weaknesses of understanding become clearly evident. Moreover, the application of semantic mapping strategy is ideal for many types of students, including English as a foreign language readers with intermediate proficiency since it used short words or phrases.

Besides, the the application of semantic mapping strategy can help students to comprehend analytical exposition texts. students who participated in the interactive semantic mapping strategy reflected greater comprehension of analytical exposition texts (Dymock, 2005). The students become more motivated to follow the reading activities and they can analyze the texts well.

In addition, the results of this study supports the theory from (Carell, Pharis, and Liberto, 1989) that semantic mapping can be very useful for reading strategy since it aims to help students identify point of view and how this point fits to the arguments. Therefore, semantic mapping can be used as a strategy to teach reading analytical exposition text.

Furthermore, the three components to create semantic map; core concept, strands and supporting information (Denton, 2007) require an active communication between teacher and students during the teaching and learning process. It indicates that the application of semantic mapping strategy can motivate students to follow the reading activities actively.

According to Kumalasari (2009), the application of semantic mapping strategy can also avoid the boredom atmosphere in the classroom because all participants are actively involved. This strategy also supports the study from Djoni (2015) that semantic mapping strategy can give better improvement to students' reading comprehension.

At last, after comparing the students' reading test in pre-test and post-test between control and experimental groups, it can be seen that the experimental group who are taught by using semantic mapping strategy has a higher score than the control group who are not. The comparison between pre-test and post-test score of the experimental group is significantly different Therefore, the use of semantic mapping strategy is effective to be applied for the eleventh graders in reading analytical exposition texts.

REFERENCES

Adams, M.J. (1990). *Beginning to Read: Thinking and Learning About Print*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Anderson, R.C. and Pearson, P.D. (1984). *A Schema-Theoretic View of Basic Processes in Reading*. New York: Longman.

Anderson, N.J. (2003). *Practical English Language Teaching*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Antonacci, P., O'Callaghan, C.M. (2011). *Developing Content Area Literacy*. United Kingdom: SAGE Publication Ltd.

Anthony, H.M., Pearson, P.D., and Raphael, T.E. (1993). *Reading Comprehension: A Selected Review, in L.M. Clearly & M.D. Linn (Eds.), Linguistics For Teachers*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Ary, D. Jacobs, C.L. Sorensen, C. Razavieh, A. (2010). *Introduction to Research in Education. (8th Ed.)*. USA: Wardsworth.

Baker, L., Wigfield, A. (1999). *Dimensions of Children's Motivation for Reading and Their Relations to Reading Activity and Reading Achievement*. USA.

Barr, R., Sadow,M,. and Blachwicz. (1990). *Reading Diagnosis for Teachers: An Instructional Approach*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bartz, A.E. (1976). *Basic Statistical Concepts in Education and The Behavioral Sciences*. Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing Company

Beers, K. (2003). *When Kids Can't Read, What Theacher Can Do: A Guide For Teacher*. Portsmouth: Heinemann.

Brown, H.D. (2001). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy (2ndEd)*. Longman: Pearson Education Co.

Brown, H. D. (2003). *Language Assessment Principles and Classroom Practices*. USA: Longman.

Brown, H.D. (2007). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy (3rd Ed.)*. New York: Pearson Education.

Carrell, P., Pharis, B.G., Liberto, J.C., (1989). *Metacognitive Strategy Training for ESL Reading TESOL*. USA.

Celce-Murcia, M. (1991). *Teaching English As A Second or Foreign Language*. New York: Newbury House.

Chall, J. (1996). *Learning to Read: The Great Debate 3rd Ed*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Chatman, S. (1995). *"Story and Discourse" [introduction]. Approaches to Media: A Reader. Boyd-Barrett, O., Newbold, C. (eds.). 1st ed*. London; New York; Sydney; Auckland: Arnold.

Christie, Frances and J. R. Martin. (ed). 2000. *Genre and Institutions: Social Process in the Workplace and School*. New York: Biddles Ltd.

Clark, S. K. (2005). *Successful Strategies for Reading in the Content Area*. USA: Shell Educational Publishing.

Cochran-Smith, M. (1993). *Inside/Outside Teacher Research and Knowledge*. New York: Teachers College Press.

D'Arcangelo, M. (2002). *The Challange Of Content Area-Reading*. Journal of Educational Research, 80, 43-46

Day, R., Bamford, J. (2000). *Extensive Reading in The Second Language Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Duffy, G. (1993). *Rethinking Strategy Instruction: Four Teachers' Development And Their Low Achievers' Understanding*. Elementary School Journal, 93, 231-247.

Dymock, S.J., & Nicholson, T. (1999). *Reading Comprehension: What is it? How do you teach it?*. Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Farrell, T. (2009). *Reading to English Language Learners*. California: Corwin Press.

Fraenkel, Wallen & Hyun. (2012). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education. Eight-Edition*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Goswami, U. (1986). *Children's Use of Analogy in Learning to Read: A Developmental Study*. Journal of Experimental Child Psychology 42, 73-83.

Guastello, E.F., Beasley, T.M., and Sinatra, R.C. (2000). *Concept Mapping Effects on Science Content Comprehension of Low-Achieving Inner-City Seventh Graders*. Remedial and Special Education, 20(6), 356-364.

Hadley, A.O., (2003). *Teaching Language in Context*. USA: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Hall, J. L., (2010). *A Guide to Doing Statistics in Second Language Research Using SPSS*. New York: Routledge.

Hanf, M. (1971). *Mapping: A technique for translating reading into thinking*. Journal of reading 14 (2), 225-230.

Harmer, J. (2007). *An Introduction to the Practice of English Language Teaching (2nd Ed.)*. USA: Longman ELT.

Harris, K. (1980). *Reading in Content Areas - Strategies for Reading to Learn; Semantic Maps*. University of Virginia.

Harvey, S. (2000). *Stratgies to Enhance Understanding*. New York: Stenhouse Publisher.

Heimlich, J. E., Pittelman, S. V. (1986). *Semantic Mapping: Classroom Applications*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association Embroke Publishers Limited.

Jalongo, M., Sobolak, M. (2011). *Supporting Young Children's Vocabulary Growth: The Challenges, Benefits, and Evidence-Based Strategies*. Early Childhood Education Journal, 38: 421-429.

Johnson, D., Pearson, P.D. (1976). *Teaching Reading Vocabulary*. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston.

Lason-Hall, J. (2010). *A Guide to Doing Statistics in Second Language Research Using SPSS*. UK: Routledge.

Lyon, D. (2001). *Surveillance Society: Monitoring Everyday Life*. London: Open University Press.

Manzo, A. (1995). *Teaching Children to be Literate: A Reflective*. New York: Holt Rinehalt and Winston., Anthony V.

McKenna, M.C., Stahl, K.A.D. (2009). *Assessment for Reading Instruction (2nd ed.)*. New York: Guilford.

Mcknight, M. W. (2000). *Overview of Reading Comprehension*. Jordanian University Available at http://ijcbr.webs.com vol. 4 no.6 October 2012. [Accessed on 31/03/14]

Mehigan, G. (2009). *Word Knowledge and Vocabulary Development*. Ireland: St. Patrick's College Press.

National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHHD) (2000) Report of the National Reading Panel. Teaching Children to Read: *An Evidence-Based Assessment of the Scientific Research Literature on Reading and its Implications for Reading Instruction*. Reports of the subgroups (NIH Publication No. 00-4769). Washington: Government Printing Office.

Nisbet, J., Shucksmith, J. (1986). *Learning Strategies*. London: Routledge.

O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1987). *The cognitive academic language learning approach: A bridge to the mainstream*. *TESOL Quarterly, 21,* 227-249.

Pallant, J. (2010). *SPSS Survival Manual*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Pardo, L. (2004). *What Every Teacher Needs To Know About Comprehension*. New York.

Pearson, D.P., Johnson, D.D. (1978). *Teaching Reading Comprehension*. Michigan: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Quinn, R. (2011). *Literacy and Numeracy For Learning and Life*. Paper presented at The Whitechurch National Conference, Dublin.

Refnaldi, G. (2010). *Essay Writing: A Process Genre Based Approach*. Unpublished Thesis Graduate Program, State University of Padang, Padang.

Rubin, J. (1987). *Learner Strategies In Learning*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Robert, A. (2009). *Using Semantic Mapping Strategy to Improve Reading Ability of IX - Grade of MTs Maarif Sukorejo - Pasuruan*. Unpublished Thesis Graduate Program, State University of Malang, Malang.

Santa, C., Havens, L. & Valdes, B. (2004). *Project CRISS: Creating independence through student-owned strategies (3 rd Ed.)*. Dubuque: Kendall/Hunt.

Savage, R. (2008). *Word Reading Instruction Methods: The Evidence Concerning Phonics*. London: Open University Press.

Schmitt, N. (2002). *An Inroduction To Applied Linguistics*. London: Routledge.

Scrivener, J. (2011). *Learning Teaching: The Essential Guide To English Language Teaching (3rd Ed.)*. Cambridge: MacMillan Education.

Silberstein, S. (1994). *Techniques And Resources In Teaching Reading*. USA: Oxford University Press.

Unsworth, Len. (ed). 2000. *Researching Language in Schools and Communities: Functional Linguistic Perspective*. New York: TJ International Ltd.